

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 13-16 and 43-46 remain pending. Independent claims 1, 13 and 43-46 have been amended.

Applicants submit herewith formal drawings for Figs. 1-27 to replace the drawings as originally filed.

Claims 1-4, 13-16 and 43-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the claims as amended and for the reasons given below.

Regarding claim 1, the office action states that the steps of designating and performing "DSP program parameters" on a digital signal process is vague. Three underlying statements are provided in the office action as the bases of the rejection:

1. It is not clear whether or not the claimed "rule table" (line 7) is the "DSP program parameters."
2. Since the relationship between the claimed "rule table" and the claimed "DSP program parameters" is not clear, the origin of the "DSP program parameters" becomes not clear. In other words, it is not clear whether the "DSP program parameters" are created in the claimed sound record/reproducing apparatus or already existed in the claimed digital processor in the connected amplifier apparatus instead.
3. In line 13, the DSP program parameter acquisition step is also vague as the location of the "parameters" is not clear. For example, it is not clear whether the DSP program parameters are stored in the recording/reproducing apparatus, or stored in the digital signal processor connected to an amplifier apparatus or stored in the claimed recording medium.
July 10, 2010 office action, pp. 2-3.

Similar statements were made in the office action regarding claims 13 and 43-46.

With respect to statement 1. above, applicants respectfully submitted that claim 1 provides no reasonable basis to question whether the claimed rule table is (the same as) the claimed DSP program parameters. Accordingly to claim 1, the rule table "associates the attribute information and digital signal processor (DSP) program parameters." Thus, from the language of the claim, it is clear the DSP program parameters constitute entries of the rule table, the DSP program parameters entries being associated with the attribute information. This is consistent with, e.g., Figs. 4A-4D of the application in which the tables associate, for example, MUSIC PIECE ID 1, MUSIC PIECE ID 4, etc. with DSP program parameters, "HALL", "CHURCH", etc. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the first basis for the §112 rejection has been fully addressed without the need to amend claim 1.

With respect to point 2. above, claim 1 has been amended to specify that the "digital signal processor (DSP) program parameters [are] previously stored in the sound recording/reproducing apparatus." Paragraphs [0075] – [0081] of Pub. No. US 2004/0037183 (which is the published version of the present application) provide examples regarding the origin and selection of the DSP program parameters.

With respect to point 3. above, applicants respectfully submit that in the acquisition step, the origin of the acquired DSP program parameters is clear in that the claim language specifies, "a DSP program parameter acquisition step of ... acquiring, from said rule table, any of the DSP program parameters that correspond to the attribute information." Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the third basis for the §112

rejection has been fully addressed without the need to amend the acquisition step of claim 1.

In view of the amendment to claim 1 and the reasons given above, it is respectfully requested that the §112 rejection of claims 1-4 be withdrawn. Based on similar amendments to independent claims 13 and 43-46, and for the reasons given above, withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claims 13-16 and 43-46 is also respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the Examiner believe that such a telephone conference call would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

Date: January 10, 2011

By: _____



Roger R. Wise
Registration No. 31,204
Customer No. 27496

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033

Encls: Replacement drawing sheets (Figs. 1-27)